

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

SIMONA TANASESCU,
Plaintiff

v.

SOHAIL I. SIMJEE, DMD, INC.,
et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. SACV 23-0110-MWF (SP)

**ORDER ACCEPTING REPORT
AND RECOMMENDATION OF
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE
JUDGE**

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636, the Court has reviewed the Motion for Attorney’s Fees (“Motion,” Docket No. 37), Plaintiff’s Opposition to the Motion (Docket No. 38), Defendants’ Reply (Docket No. 39), the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (“Report,” Docket No. 43), Plaintiff’s Objections to the Report (“Objections,” Docket No. 45), Defendants’ Reply to the Objections (Docket No. 46), and other relevant records on file.

The Court has conducted a de novo review of the portions of the Report to which Objections were directed. The Court agrees with Defendants that Plaintiff’s twenty-nine pages of Objections merely rehash arguments already made in her other lengthy filings alleging that Defendants disrespected the state court and conducted an “illegal scheme” in relation to the underlying state-court vexatious litigant

1 finding, which is not pertinent to the determination at issue in the current Report:
2 proof of fees and costs and the reasonableness of them. (Docket No. 43 at 5; Docket
3 No. 45 at 2-5, 11-14; Docket No. 46). Plaintiff makes no legitimate challenge to
4 that determination.

5 The Objections are overruled.


6 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that:

7 (1) The Report is **ACCEPTED** and adopted as the Court's own findings and
8 conclusions;

9 (2) Defendants' Motion (Docket No. 37) is **GRANTED**; and

10 (3) Plaintiff is **ORDERED** to pay Defendants attorney's fees in the amount of
11 \$7,920.

12
13 Dated: October 11, 2024

14 
15 MICHAEL W. FITZGERALD
16 United States District Judge
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28